



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

true learning and to the honor of human nature, one would gladly think is rare in the annals of scientific research? Merely in the modest expression of a desire to have his name publicly mentioned in connection with a theory, of which, as is now clearly shown, he was the real and only author.

Schimper urged Braun, who was fully cognizant of the facts, to uphold him in the defense of his rights. But Braun declined to take part in the controversy, on the ground that he "could not approve of the angry attitude of the two friends." Nevertheless, in a letter addressed to Professor Röper, of Rostock, and dated February 22d, 1840, he refers to the glacial theory and declares that "Agassiz and Charpentier, who are now doing most in this matter, are both Schimper's pupils."

Schimper died at Schwetzingen, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, December 21st, 1867. At Munich he was the favorite pupil of Schelling, who predicted a brilliant future for him. That his subsequent career did not fully realize the promise of his youth was due partly to a certain idealistic indifference to worldly emoluments, but, in a great measure, to the persistent enmity of Leopold von Buch, who could not forgive the young botanist for having introduced into geology a new ice-epoch-making idea, of which he, the veteran geognost, had never dreamed. There is a grim irony in the fate, which, on the one hand, robbed him of the honor of being recognized as the originator of the theory, for which, on the other hand, he appears to have suffered no little persecution.

The ignoring policy which Agassiz inaugurated in his first work on glaciers, he pursued to the bitter end. In the recently published "Life and Correspondence," edited by Mrs. Agassiz, Schimper is mentioned about half a dozen times. He is spoken of as a "most congenial companion," "a young botanist of brilliant promise," and is playfully referred to as "our professor of philosophy;" but there is no intimation that he ever saw a glacier, or took the slightest interest in glacial phenomena.

Dr. Volger's article, of which we have given an abstract, has already attracted considerable attention among scientific men in Germany, and, unless its statements can be refuted, will seriously injure the reputation of Agassiz as a *savant*, and leave an indelible stain upon his character as a man.

E. P. EVANS.

II.

IRISH AID IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

WITH one glance at Faneuil Hall, and the Irish "love of liberty" that would prevent Englishmen from using it in polite and harmless celebration of "Queen Victoria's Jubilee," permit me to correct the public misapprehension that the Irish were of any great and special service to this republic of ours, in the days of the Revolution. Among Irish-Americans and the politicians who court their votes, the claim of such service usually comes up at public meetings about as follows:

"Ill would it become us to turn a deaf ear to the cry of suffering Ireland when we remember how, in the hour of our own travail—in the hour when our own country was coming into the world amid roar of cannon and groans of anguish—it was Ireland that held out to us the hand of fellowship, etc., etc."

Those who read the papers doubtless remember many orations framed upon this model. Sometimes the speaker goes farther, and attempts to particularize; and then we see something like the recent effort of a Massachusetts statesman and ex-governor who, in recounting the benefits received, says: "She sent us Montgomery! and also remarks with unconscious humor, "Remember the memorial

which Congress addressed to Ireland !” He does not give Ireland’s response, but leaves us to believe that a beggar is indebted to him he asks for aims, even though no aims be forthcoming.

Now, let us look, first, at the individual cases of prominent Irishmen in the Revolution.

There were soldiers of fortune from almost every country in Europe, who thronged to the revolutionary army, even to the extent that Congress was seriously embarrassed to provide offices for a host of applicants who looked for nothing less than major generalships and separate commands. Among these there were doubtless Irishmen, but, unfortunately for the force of the demagogues’ plea, we do not find that our Irish auxiliaries were unmitigated blessings. They cannot point to a single name like Lafayette, Kosciusko, Pulaski, or Steuben ; but there was Conway, whose restless, scheming spirit, and selfish treachery, well nigh imperiled the cause of liberty, and whose conspiracy to degrade Washington, to drive him from the service with a blackened reputation and to install the shallow Gates as commander-in-chief of the American army is registered in history as “ Conway’s Cabal.” Fortunately the attempt failed.

I do not include the name of Richard Montgomery, the name that is most often quoted by the Irish panegyrist—first, because he did not come here to assist us, but was a resident in the colonies before the war broke out, and second, because, though born on Irish soil, he was certainly not an Irishman. His name alone discloses his Scotch lineage, and, as a matter of fact, he was a descendant of one of Cromwell’s settlers—one of that class upon whom the vials of Irish wrath are ever emptied, and who, as Macauley informs us, would resent the name “ Irish ” as a deadly insult.

I must be pardoned for mentioning, also, the historical circumstance that the soldier who, for an English bribe, undertook to poison George Washington, was an Irishman. But I have no wish to dwell on this part of the subject. It is not just to charge the acts of isolated individuals against their race, any more than it is just to credit to the race the virtues of stray individuals.

And now for a few hard facts which really bear upon the issue,—only a few out of many, but enough to explode forever the fiction of American indebtedness to Ireland on the score of revolutionary succor.

In the first place, as to the disposition of the rank and file of Irish immigrants, I quote from Bancroft’s “ History of the United States,” Vol. X., page 175 (first octavo edition) :

“ While it was no longer possible for the Americans to keep up their army by enlistments, the British gained numerous recruits from immigrants. In Philadelphia, Howe had formed a regiment of Roman Catholics. With still better success, Clinton courted the Irish. They had fled from the prosecutions of inexorable landlords to a country which offered them freeholds. By flattering their nationality, and their sense of the importance attached to their numbers, Clinton allured them to a combination directly averse to their own interests, and raised for Lord Rawdon a large regiment, in which officers and men were exclusively Irish. *Among them were nearly five hundred deserters from the American army* ”

The italics are mine.

So much for the spirit of the Irish immigrants.

Now let us see about the sympathy of the Irish in Ireland.

In 1779 the Spanish government, then at war with England, sent an emissary, a Catholic priest, to see what could be done in the way of creating a diversion in Ireland to aid the cause of the allies in Europe and America. Bancroft speaks of his mission as follows :

"He could have no success. After the first shedding of American blood in 1775, one hundred and twenty-one Irish Catholics, having indeed no formal representative authority, yet professing to speak not for themselves only, but 'for all their fellow Roman Catholic Irish subjects,' had addressed the English Secretary in Ireland, 'in proof of their grateful attachment to the best of kings, and their *just abhorrence of the unnatural American rebellion*,' and had 'made a tender of two millions of faithful and affectionate hearts and hands in defense of his person and government in any part of the world.'"

The italics are again my own. My references are Bancroft's "History," Vol. X., page 252, and Froude's, "The English in Ireland," Vol. II., page 176.

Now turn to Ireland as represented in her Parliament; for she had a Parliament of her own then. I quote again from Bancroft, Vol. X., page 453.

"When the tidings from Lexington and Bunker Hill reached them (the Irish), their Parliament came to a vote that 'they heard of the rebellion with abhorrence, and were ready to show to the world their attachment to the sacred person of the King.' Taking advantage of its eminently loyal disposition, Lord North obtained its leave to employ four thousand men of the Irish army for service in America. That army should by law have consisted of twelve thousand men; but it mustered scarcely more than nine thousand. Out of these the strongest and best, without regard to the prescribed limitation of numbers, were selected, and eight regiments, all that could be formed, were shipped across the Atlantic."

This, it may be said, was the act of the Irish Parliament as a whole. But to close the last loophole of doubt, let us examine the position taken by the Irish patriots, with Henry Grattan at their head. Bancroft again says, on page 454:

"When, in 1778, it appeared how much the commissioners sent to America had been willing to concede to insurgents for the sake of reconciliation, the patriots of Ireland awoke to a sense of what they might demand. . . . At the opening of the session of October, 1779, Grattan moved an amendment to the address, that the nation could be saved only by free export and free import, or according to the terser words that were finally chosen, by free trade. The friends of government dared not resist the amendment, and it was carried unanimously. New taxes were refused. The ordinary supplies, usually granted for two years, were granted for six months. The house was in earnest, the people were in earnest. . . . Great Britain being already taxed to the uttermost by its conflict with America, Lord North persuaded its Parliament to concede the claims of the neighboring island to commercial equality."

Here we have the patriot party of Ireland signaling the American revolution, not by sympathy, not by aid, but making use of the occasion for obtaining advantages for themselves in return for the resources they furnished England to help suppress the cause of American independence! Comment is entirely unnecessary; and, while, perhaps, we should not blame them, under the circumstances, for the course they took, yet when they claim our *gratitude* for it, they exhibit an ignorance or an impudence for which they should occasionally, at least, be snubbed. There may have been isolated instances of Irish sympathy with "the spirit of '76," which I have been unable to discover; but it would require a long list of them to weigh much against the recorded facts. Let us hear somewhat less of this "debt to Ireland," save, of course, from the lips of the Irish agitator or American demagogue. By giving to the Irishman or German praise which has not been earned, we belittle the gratitude which we do owe to one and only one European race, for aiding our American Revolution. To France as a nation, and to the French as individuals, we are deeply indebted; and those who, for political capital, harp other names and display other flags, should remember that by so doing they insult the country to which America owes most, but whose citizens are not here in sufficient numbers to incite the politician to defend their merits.

DUFFIELD OSBORNE.